

A Quantum Search Algorithm for a Specified Number of Targets*

Mark A. Rubin

Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
244 Wood Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02420-9185
rubin@ll.mit.edu

Abstract

The quantum search algorithm of Chen and Diao, which finds with certainty a single target item in an unsorted database, is modified so as to be capable of searching for an arbitrary specified number of target items. If the number of targets, ν_0 , is a power of four, the new algorithm will with certainty find one of the targets in a database of $\mathcal{N}$ items using $(1/2) \left(3(N/\nu_0)^{\log_4 3} - 1 \right) \approx (1/2) \left(3(N/\nu_0)^{0.7925} - 1 \right)$ oracle calls, where N is the smallest power of four greater than or equal to $\mathcal{N}$. If ν_0 is not a power of four, the algorithm will, with a probability of at least one-half, find one of the targets using no more than $(1/2) \left(9(N/\nu)^{\log_4 3} - 1 \right)$ calls, where ν is the smallest power of four greater than or equal to ν_0 .

1 Introduction

Recently Chen and Diao [1] presented a quantum algorithm for searching an unsorted database capable of finding, with certainty, a single target item in an $\mathcal{N}$ -item database after $2\lceil \log_4 \mathcal{N} \rceil$ iterations of certain unitary operations. ($\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to x .) Grassl [2] and Tu and Long [3] have given a recursive implementation of these unitary operations, and have pointed out that, with this implementation, the number of oracle calls required for the j^{th} iteration increases exponentially with j .

In this paper I present a modification of the algorithm of [1] for searching an unsorted database of $\mathcal{N}$ items for $\nu_0 \geq 1$ target items, provided that the number of targets ν_0 is

*This work was sponsored by the Department of the Air Force under Contract F19628-00-C-0002. Opinions, interpretations, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the author and are not necessarily endorsed by the United States Air Force.

known in advance. In Section 2 below I discuss the case of ν_0 equal to a power of four; in this case the algorithm will find one of the target items with unit probability. In Section 3 I discuss the case of ν_0 not equal to a power of four; in this case the algorithm will find one of the target items with probability of at least one-half. The number of oracle calls required using the recursive implementation is given in Section 4. The notation and terminology follow, in general, those of [1] and [2].

2 Number of Targets a Power of Four

Denote the $\mathcal{N}$ items in the database $\mathcal{D}$ by $w_i, i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}$. Of these items, a total of ν_0 are members of the subset T of target items. An oracle function $f(w_i)$ indicates whether a selected item is or is not a target:

$$\begin{aligned} f(w_i) &= 1, & w_i \in T, \\ &= 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

If $\mathcal{N}$ is not already a power of four, we embed the database $\mathcal{D}$ in a larger database D containing additional non-target items such that the total number of items in D is the smallest power of four larger than $\mathcal{N}$:

$$D = \mathcal{D} \cup \{w_{\mathcal{N}+1}, \dots, w_N\}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$N = 2^{2n}, \tag{3}$$

n an integer, i.e.,

$$n = \lceil \log_4 \mathcal{N} \rceil, \tag{4}$$

so

$$N > \mathcal{N} > N/4. \tag{5}$$

The above enlargement of the database is as in [1]. Here, in addition, we embed D in a database $\widetilde{D}$ which is four times larger still:

$$\widetilde{D} = D \cup \{w_{N+1}, w_{N+2}, \dots, w_{\widetilde{N}}\}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\widetilde{N} = 4N = 2^{2\tilde{n}}. \tag{7}$$

That is,

$$\tilde{n} = n + 1. \tag{8}$$

All of the additional items not in $\mathcal{D}$ are by definition non-targets, so equation (1) still holds and the cardinality of T is still ν_0 .

For the database to be searched by a quantum computer [4], the $\widetilde{N}$ items in $\widetilde{D}$ are set in one-to-one correspondence with the $\widetilde{N}$ computational-basis states $|a_1 a_2 \dots a_{2\tilde{n}}\rangle$:

$$w_i \leftrightarrow |a_1(i) a_2(i) \dots a_{2\tilde{n}}(i)\rangle, \quad i = 1, \dots, \widetilde{N} \tag{9}$$

where each of the eigenvalues $a_j(i)$ is either 0 or 1. The $2\tilde{n}$ -component vector of a_j 's associated with w_i is termed the symbol of w_i :

$$S(w_i) = a_1(i)a_2(i) \dots a_{2\tilde{n}}(i). \quad (10)$$

We also define auxiliary symbol functions

$$\begin{aligned} S_j(w_i) &= a_1(i) \dots a_j(i), \quad j = 1, \dots, 2\tilde{n}, \\ S_{2\tilde{n}}(w_i) &= S(w_i). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It should be emphasized that the correspondence (9) is *not* chosen to make the symbol $S(w_i)$ a binary representation of the item index i . On the contrary, it is essential for what follows that none of the N items in the set D be represented by states such that $S_2(w_i) = 00$. That is, we require that

$$w_i \in D \Rightarrow S_2(w_i) \neq 00. \quad (12)$$

(We could, for example, establish the correspondence (9) so that $w_i \in D \Rightarrow S_2(w_i) = 11$.) Condition (12) implies

$$w_i \in T \Rightarrow S_2(w_i) \neq 00. \quad (13)$$

Extending the technique employed in [1] to the case of multiple targets, we select ν_0 of the items with auxiliary symbols $S_2(w_i) = 00$ to be “ground state items.” Specifically, the ν_0 elements of the set G of ground state items,

$$G = \{w_{G_1}, w_{G_2}, \dots, w_{G_{\nu_0}}\}, \quad (14)$$

are those with the symbols

$$\begin{aligned} S(w_{G_1}) &= 00 \dots 000000 \\ S(w_{G_2}) &= 00 \dots 000001 \\ S(w_{G_3}) &= 00 \dots 000010 \\ S(w_{G_4}) &= 00 \dots 000011 \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The rightmost $2p$ entries in $S(w_{G_{\nu_0}})$ are all 1's and constitute a binary representation of $\nu_0 - 1$, where

$$2^{2p} = \nu_0. \quad (16)$$

We can now define the auxiliary functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(w_i) &= 1 \quad \text{if } S_{2j} = 00 \dots 00 \text{ but } w_i \notin G, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise; } j = 1, \dots, \tilde{n} - p, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and, in terms of these, the auxiliary oracle functions

$$F_j(w_i) = f(w_i) \vee f_j(w_i). \quad (18)$$

(The symbol “ $\vee$ ” denotes logical OR.) Note that

$$F_{\tilde{n}-p}(w_i) = f(w_i). \quad (19)$$

The starting state for the iteration is the equally-weighted superposition of computational basis states obtained from the state $|w_{G_1}\rangle = |00\dots 00\rangle$ by a Walsh-Hadamard transformation,

$$|s_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{N}}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} |w_i\rangle. \quad (20)$$

Starting from $|s_0\rangle$, a total of n_I^0 iterations are performed of the transformation

$$|s_{j+1}\rangle = -\mathcal{I}_{s_j} \mathcal{I}_j |s_j\rangle, \quad j = 0, \dots, n_I^0 - 1, \quad (21)$$

where

$$n_I^0 = \tilde{n} - p. \quad (22)$$

The unitary operator $\mathcal{I}_j$ in (21) is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_j = \mathbf{I} - 2 \sum_{i|F_{j+1}(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle\langle w_i|, \quad (23)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity operator. In terms of its action on computational-basis states,

$$\mathcal{I}_j |w_i\rangle = (-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} |w_i\rangle. \quad (24)$$

The unitary operator $\mathcal{I}_{s_j}$ in (21) is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_{s_j} = \mathbf{I} - 2 |s_j\rangle\langle s_j|. \quad (25)$$

The proof that, after n_I^0 iterations, the resulting state $|s_{n_I^0}\rangle$ is an equally-weighted superposition of the ν_0 states $w_i \in T$ proceeds by induction. Using (20), (21), (24) and (25), we find, for $j = 0$,

$$|s_1\rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{N}}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} (-1)^{F_1(w_i)} |w_i\rangle - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\tilde{N}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} (-1)^{F_1(w_i)} \right) |s_0\rangle \right]. \quad (26)$$

To evaluate the second sum in (26), divide the set of $\tilde{N}$ states into two groups, those for which $S_2(w_i) = 00$ and those for which $S_2(w_i) \neq 00$. The first group contains $2^{2(\tilde{n}-1)}$ states, of which the $2^{2(\tilde{n}-1)} - \nu_0$ states not in G have $F_1(w_i) = 1$, and the remaining ν_0 states in G have $F_1(w_i) = 0$ (see eqs. (17), (18)). Of the $3 \cdot 2^{2(\tilde{n}-1)}$ states with $S_2(w_i) \neq 00$, ν_0 of these have $F_1(w_i) = 1$ by virtue of being target states ($f(w_i) = 1$), and the remaining $3 \cdot 2^{2(\tilde{n}-1)} - \nu_0$ have $F_1(w_i) = 0$. So,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} (-1)^{F_1(w_i)} = \frac{\tilde{N}}{2} = 2^{2\tilde{n}-1}, \quad (27)$$

and (26) reduces to

$$|s_1\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{n}+1} \sum_{i|F_1(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle. \quad (28)$$

We now assume that for some j ,

$$|s_j\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{n}+j} \sum_{i|F_j(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle, \quad (29)$$

and derive the form of $|s_{j+1}\rangle$. From (29), (21), (24) and (25),

$$|s_{j+1}\rangle = -2^{-\tilde{n}+j} \left[\sum_{i|F_j(w_i)=1} (-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} |w_i\rangle - 2^{-\tilde{n}+j+1} \left(\sum_{i|F_j(w_i)=1} (-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} \right) |s_j\rangle \right]. \quad (30)$$

The second sum in (30) can again be evaluated by counting. The items w_i for which $F_j(w_i) = 1$ fall into two disjoint groups, those for which $f_j(w_i) = 1$, and the elements of T . Of the former group, $2^{2(\tilde{n}-j-1)} - \nu_0$ have $F_{j+1}(w_i) = 1$ (those with $S_{2j+2}(w_i) = 00 \dots 00$ —recall that the elements of G are not members of $\{w_i | F_k(w_i) = 1\}$ for *any* k), and the remaining $3 \cdot 2^{2(\tilde{n}-j-1)}$ have $F_{j+1}(w_i) = 0$. As for the elements of T , all ν_0 have $F_{j+1}(w_i) = 1$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i|F_j(w_i)=1} (-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} = 2^{2(\tilde{n}-j)-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, \tilde{n} - p - 1. \quad (31)$$

Using (31) in (30), we obtain

$$|s_{j+1}\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{n}+j+1} \sum_{i|F_{j+1}(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle. \quad (32)$$

After applying n_I^0 iterations (21) to the starting state (20), we therefore obtain (keeping in mind that $F_{n_I^0}(w_i) = f(w_i)$)

$$|s_{n_I^0}\rangle = 2^{-p} \sum_{i|w_i \in T} |w_i\rangle. \quad (33)$$

A measurement of $|s_{n_I^0}\rangle$ in the computational basis will with certainty yield one of the states corresponding to a target item.

3 Number of Targets Not a Power of Four

Only a small number of changes are required in the analysis presented above to produce an algorithm which will yield one of the target states with a probability greater than one-quarter when the number of targets is not a power of four, and which reduces to the algorithm of Section 2 when the number of targets is a power of four. All of the definitions through the selection of the ground-state items, eq. (15), remain applicable. However, the integer p defined in (16) must be everywhere replaced with $\tilde{p}$

$$2^{2\tilde{p}} = \nu, \quad (34)$$

where ν is the smallest power of four larger than ν_0 . I.e.,

$$\tilde{p} = \lceil \log_4 \nu_0 \rceil, \quad (35)$$

$$\nu > \nu_0 > \nu/4. \quad (36)$$

The rightmost $2\tilde{p}$ entries in $S(w_{G_{\nu_0}})$ constitute a binary representation of $\nu_0 - 1$, but they will are not all 1's. The definitions (17) and (18) of the auxiliary functions $f_j(w_i)$ and the auxiliary oracle functions $F_j(w_i)$ remain unchanged. However, most significantly, eq. (19) is replaced with

$$\{w_i | F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i) = 1\} \supset T, \quad (37)$$

since not all items with $S_{2(\tilde{n}-\tilde{p})} = 00 \dots 00$ are in G .

So, a derivation parallel to that in Section 2 leads to the conclusion that, by beginning with the initial state (20) and performing $\tilde{n} - \tilde{p}$ iterations (21), we obtain the state

$$|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{p}} \sum_{i|F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle. \quad (38)$$

If a measurement in the computational basis is made of the state (38), the probability that one of the target states will be obtained is

$$P_0(\rho) = \rho, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\rho = \frac{\nu_0}{\nu}. \quad (40)$$

The probability of finding a target state is thus between one, when $\nu_0 = \nu$ ($\rho = 1$), and somewhat above one-quarter, when $\nu_0 = \nu/4 + 1$ ($\rho = 1/4 + 1/\nu$).

Now suppose that, rather than making a measurement after $\tilde{n} - \tilde{p}$ iterations, we perform an “extra” iteration, i.e., compute

$$|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+1}\rangle = -\mathcal{I}_{s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}} \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}} |s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}\rangle. \quad (41)$$

before measuring. The definitions (17), (18) of $f_j(w_i)$ and $F_j(w_i)$ work for $j > \tilde{n} - \tilde{p}$ and, with the relations (34), (36), imply that, regardless of the value of ν_0 ,

$$F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+q}(w_i) = f(w_i), \quad q \geq 1. \quad (42)$$

For $j = \tilde{n} - \tilde{p}$ the summation formula corresponding to (31) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i|F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i)=1} (-1)^{F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+1}(w_i)} &= \sum_{i|F_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i)=1} (-1)^{f(w_i)} \\ &= 2^{2\tilde{p}} - 2\nu_0 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The state resulting after one extra iteration is

$$|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+1}\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{p}+1} \left[(1 - \delta) \sum_{i|f(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle - \delta \sum_{i|f_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}=1} |w_i\rangle \right] \quad (44)$$

where

$$\delta = (4\rho - 1)/2. \quad (45)$$

The probability of obtaining a target state upon measuring $|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+1}\rangle$ is

$$P_1(\rho) = \rho(3 - 4\rho)^2. \quad (46)$$

For $1/4 < \rho < 1/2$, $P_1(\rho) > P_0(\rho)$, while, for $1/2 < \rho < 1$, $P_1(\rho) < P_0(\rho)$. So, the appropriate strategy is to make a measurement after

$$n_I^> = \tilde{n} - \tilde{p} \quad (47)$$

iterations if $1/2 \leq \rho < 1$, and to make a measurement after

$$n_I^< = \tilde{n} - \tilde{p} + 1 \quad (48)$$

iterations if $1/4 < \rho < 1/2$. The probability of obtaining a target state will in this way be at least as large as $P_0(1/2) = P_1(1/2) = 1/2$ (see Fig. 1).

Yet another iteration before measurement gives

$$|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+2}\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{p}+1} \left[(1-\delta)(1-C) \sum_{i|f(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle + \delta(1+C) \sum_{i|f_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle \right] \quad (49)$$

where

$$C = 8 \left[(1-\delta)^2 \rho - \delta^2 (1-\rho) \right], \quad (50)$$

and a probability of target-finding of

$$P_2(\rho) = 4\rho(1-\delta)^2(1-C)^2. \quad (51)$$

Despite the extra iteration, the probability of obtaining a target state when $\rho = 1/2$ is not increased; $P_2(1/2) = 1/2$. This is true for an arbitrary number of additional iterations. The quantum state obtained after $\tilde{n} - \tilde{p} + q$ iterations, $q \geq 1$, is of the form

$$|s_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}+q}\rangle = 2^{-\tilde{p}+1} \left[A_q \sum_{i|f(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle + B_q \sum_{i|f_{\tilde{n}-\tilde{p}}(w_i)=1} |w_i\rangle \right], \quad (52)$$

where A_q and B_q satisfy the recursion relations

$$A_{q+1} = \left(1 - 8 \left[A_q^2 \rho - B_q^2 (1-\rho) \right] \right) A_q, \quad (53)$$

$$B_{q+1} = - \left(1 + 8 \left[A_q^2 \rho - B_q^2 (1-\rho) \right] \right) B_q. \quad (54)$$

The probability of finding a target upon measurement is

$$P_q(\rho) = 4A_q^2 \rho. \quad (55)$$

From (44) and (52) we see that $A_1 = 1/2$ and $B_1 = -1/2$ when $\rho = 1/2$. The relations (53)-(55) then show that

$$P_q(1/2) = 1/2 \quad \forall \quad q \geq 1. \quad (56)$$

This is not in any sense to claim that iteration algorithms different than those considered here might not improve on the probability of finding a target when $\rho = 1/2$. Nor is it to say that iterations beyond $\tilde{n} - \tilde{p} + 1$ necessarily have no use. Probability functions $P_q(\rho)$, $q \geq 2$, can, for values of $\rho \neq 1/2$, be larger than either $P_0(\rho)$ or $P_1(\rho)$, indeed as large as 1 (see Fig. 1).

4 Required Number of Oracle Calls

Grassl [2] and Tu and Long [3] have presented the following implementations of the operators I_j and I_{s_j} , and have evaluated the number of oracle calls required each time these operators are applied. From eq. (24) we see that I_j can be written as

$$I_j = \sum_i (-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} |w_i\rangle\langle w_i|. \quad (57)$$

From the condition (12) on the representation of elements of D (and, therefore, on all elements of the target set T), and the definitions (17), (18) of f_j , F_j , it follows that

$$(-1)^{F_{j+1}(w_i)} = (-1)^{f(w_i)} (-1)^{f_{j+1}(w_i)}. \quad (58)$$

Therefore

$$I_j = \left(I - 2 \sum_{i|w_i \in T} |w_i\rangle\langle w_i| \right) \left(\sum_k (-1)^{f_{j+1}(w_k)} |w_k\rangle\langle w_k| \right), \quad (59)$$

and we see that each application of I_j requires a single call to the oracle, since the f_j 's are independent of f .

From the iteration condition (21), the definition (25) of I_{s_j} , and the unitarity of I_j and I_{s_j} , we see that the operators I_{s_j} satisfy the relation

$$I_{s_{j+1}} = I_{s_j} I_j I_{s_j} I_j I_{s_j}. \quad (60)$$

Let $t(j)$ denote the number of oracle calls required by I_{s_j} . Since I_j requires one oracle call, (60) implies

$$t(j+1) = 3t(j) + 2. \quad (61)$$

For $j = 0$,

$$I_{s_0} = I - 2|s_0\rangle\langle s_0|, \quad (62)$$

which is independent of f , so

$$t(0) = 0 \quad (63)$$

and $t(j)$ has the closed form

$$t(j) = 3^j - 1. \quad (64)$$

Taking into account the single oracle call required by I_j , the total number of oracle calls required for n_I iterations of (21) is

$$\mathcal{C}(n_I) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_I-1} t(j) + n_I \quad (65)$$

which, using (64), has the value

$$\mathcal{C}(n_I) = (1/2) (3^{n_I} - 1). \quad (66)$$

It follows from the results of Section 2 that, for ν_0 a power of four, the required number of oracle calls to obtain a target with unit probability is

$$\mathcal{C}^0 = \mathcal{C}(n_I^0) = (1/2) (3(N/\nu_0)^{\log_4 3} - 1). \quad (67)$$

If ν_0 is not a power of four, the results of Section 3 imply that the number of oracle calls to obtain a target state with probability of at least one half is

$$\mathcal{C}^> = \mathcal{C}(n_I^>) = (1/2) \left(3(N/\nu)^{\log_4 3} - 1 \right) \quad (68)$$

if $\rho = \nu_0/\nu$ is between $1/2$ and 1 , and

$$\mathcal{C}^< = \mathcal{C}(n_I^<) = (1/2) \left(9(N/\nu)^{\log_4 3} - 1 \right) \quad (69)$$

if ρ is between $1/4$ and $1/2$.

The original algorithm of Chen and Diao [1] performs two series of n iterations of (21), so the number of oracle calls required to find the unique target item by that method is

$$\mathcal{C}_{CD} = 2\mathcal{C}(n) = 3N^{\log_4 3} - 1. \quad (70)$$

The exponent $\log_4 3$ is approximately equal to 0.7925 . So, with this particular implementation of the operators I_j and I_{s_j} , the computational complexity of the algorithms of [1] and the present paper scales more slowly than that of the best possible classical algorithm ($\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{N})$), but not as slowly as that of Grover's algorithm [5] ($\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\mathcal{N}})$). Unlike Grover's algorithm, these algorithms will find a target item with certainty¹ if the number of targets is a power of four. It is not known at present whether the implementation employed here is the most efficient possible, or if implementations requiring fewer oracle calls may exist.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Markus Grassl for providing a prepublication copy of [2], and the anonymous reviewer of the previous version of this paper for also pointing out the relation (60).

References

- [1] G. Chen and Z. Diao, "Exponentially fast quantum search algorithm," quant-ph/0011109 v3 (2000).
- [2] M. Grassl, "Comment on 'An exponentially fast quantum search algorithm,' " unpublished (2001).
- [3] C. C. Tu and G. L. Long, "Chen and Diao's quantum search algorithm is not exponentially fast," quant-ph/0110098 (2001).
- [4] N. D. Mermin, "Lecture notes for physicists on the theory of quantum computation," http://www.lasp.cornell.edu/lasp_data/NMermin.html
- [5] L. K. Grover, in *Proc. 28th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (ACM Press, New York, 1996), p. 212; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 325 (1997); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4329 (1998).

¹Versions of Grover's algorithm which find targets with certainty have been presented in [6, 7, 8].

- [6] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, M. Mosca, A. Tapp, “Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation,” quant-ph/0005055 (2000).
- [7] P. Høyer, “On arbitrary phases in quantum amplitude amplification,” *Phys. Rev.* **A62**, 052304 (2000); quant-ph/0006031.
- [8] G. L. Long, “Grover algorithm with zero theoretical failure rate,” quant-ph/010607 (2001).

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Probability P_q of finding a target with q “extra” iterations, as a function of ρ . Solid line: $q = 0$. Dashed line: $q = 1$. Dotted line: $q = 2$.

